

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The six attached sheets of drawings remove all changes to the figures from the Response dated January 22, 2007, and therefore, return the figures back to their state on the filing date of March 2, 2004.

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 are pending in the application, with Claims 1 and 8 being the independent claims.

In the Office Action, an allegation of new matter being added is raised due to the recitation of “an optical axis[or character reference A3] of the camera module is parallel with the first hinge axis” in the Response dated January 22, 2007.

The drawings are objected to because they include the reference character A3 not mentioned in the description filed on March 2, 2004.

Claims 1 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 ¶1 because there is no mention of “an optical axis [or character reference A3] of the camera module is parallel with the first hinge axis” at the time the application was filed.

Claims 1-3, 5, 7-11, 13, 15, and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kfoury (U.S. Patent No. 6,549,789) in view of Saburi et al. (European Patent Publication No. 1096771 A1) and further in view of Isashi (U.S. Pat. No. 5,719,799).

Claims 4 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kfoury in view of Saburi et al, further in view of Isashi, and further in view of Kim (U.S. Pat. No. 6,397,078).

Claims 6, 12 and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kfoury in view of Saburi et al, further in view of Isashi, and further in view of Ikeuchi (U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2003/0092401).

Regarding the allegation of new matter being added, Applicants respectfully traverse the allegation. It is well known that a camera lens inherently has an optical axis. The recitation of “an optical axis [or character reference A3] of the camera module is parallel with the first hinge axis” in the Response dated January 22, 2007 only explicitly describes an inherent element of the camera module illustrated in the drawings. The amendments as set forth above are believed to

overcome the allegation.

Regarding the objection to the drawings, the amendments of the drawings as set forth above are believed to overcome the objection.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 1 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §112 ¶1, Amended Claims 1 and 8 as set forth above are believed to overcome the rejection.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 1 under §103(a), the Examiner states that Kfoury in view of Saburi et al. and further in view of Isashi renders the claim obvious. Amended Claim 1 teaches a portable terminal comprising a first housing; a hinge housing for defining a first hinge axis and a second hinge axis perpendicular to the first hinge axis; a second housing; and a sub-housing having a camera module, the camera module receiving *a camera lens facing in a direction parallel with the first hinge axis*.

Saburi et al. discloses a portable communication terminal 51 comprising a top flip 57, a bottom flip 52 rotatably connected to the top flip 57 about a first hinge axis, and a camera unit 54 rotatably connected to the bottom flip 52 about a second hinge axis parallel with the first hinge axis (FIGs. 6A and 6B). The camera unit 54 has a camera lens clearly facing in a direction perpendicular to both the first and second hinge axes (FIGs. 6A and 6B). Saburi et al. fails to disclose anywhere *a camera lens facing in a direction parallel with the first hinge axis* taught by Amended Claim 1.

Kfoury discloses a portable electronic device comprising a first housing portion 202, a second housing portion 204 rotatable about two perpendicular hinge axes with respect to the first housing 202, the first housing portion 202 having a detachable user interface 1400 (FIGs. 1 and 14). Kfoury fails to disclose anywhere a portable terminal having *a camera lens facing in a direction parallel with the first hinge axis* taught by Amended Claim 1.

Isashi discloses a portable information processing apparatus 1a (e.g., notebook personal computer) comprising a first member 3, a second member 5, and a hinge member 6 for hingedly


connecting to the first member 3 and the second member 5 via respectively two parallel hinge axes, *the hinge member 6 receiving a photographing unit 7a* (FIGs. 1A and 2). In contrast, the camera module taught by Amended Claim 1 of the present invention is received in a sub-housing, which is structurally distinct from the hinge housing, or the hinge member of Isashi.

Amended Claim 1 structurally differs from Kfoury, Saburi et al., Isashi, or any combination thereof.

The above rationale for Amended Claim 1 also similarly applies to Amended Claim 8 under §103(a) regarding Kfoury, Saburi et al., Isashi, or any combination thereof.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the application, namely, Claims 1-19, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicants' attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell
Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicants

The Farrell Law Firm
333 Earle Ovington Boulevard, Suite 701
Uniondale, New York 11553

Tel 516-228-3565
Fax 516-228-8475

PJF/DGL/mk